Abstract Proceedings of the Travancore Legislative Council.

The Council met again in the Dewan's room, Public offices, at 12 noon, on Friday the 14th December 1894.

PRESENT :—

The Dewan ... ... *Presiding.*

M. R. Ry. K. Krishnaswamy Rao Avergal.
M. R. Ry. V. Nagam Iyer Avergal.
M. R. Ry. P. Thanu Pillay Avergal.
M. R. Ry. Rama Vurma Avergal, Raja of Perapanad.
M. R. Ry. Ramanatha Rao Avergal.
M. R. Ry. A. M. Muthunayagom Pillay Avergal.

CIVIL PROCEDURE CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

M. R. Ry. P. Thanu Pillay moved for the suspension of the standing orders so as to allow him, in the absence of Mr. Watts, to move the amendment to the Civil Procedure Code Amendment Bill, which had been previously circulated.

The standing orders were suspended by the President and Mr. Thanu Pillay moved the following as section VI. "Insert the words "or Sripadom Palace" between the words "Government" and "shall" in "section 401 of the Civil Procedure Code." He also moved the omission of section VII of the Bill.

The Rajah of Perapanad seconded the motion.

In consequence of the above motion being carried, old section VI of the Bill becomes section VII.

The Bill as amended was passed and it was resolved that it be read again on a future day of which previous notice shall be given.

JENMI AND TENANT BILL.

The consideration of the Jenmi and Tenant Bill was then resumed.

The addition to section 5 proposed at the previous meeting was further discussed.

After the discussion Mr. Nagam Iyer said :—

"If, however, this amendment is necessary in order to uphold the decisions of courts already referred to, the earliest reported decision is, according to my friend Mr. Muthunayagom Pillay, not older than 1054 M. E. i. e. 16 years ago. I would therefore propose that 16 years be substituted for 25 years in the *amendment*. This will save the tenants who have correctly understood and acted according to the terms of the Proclamation between 1042 and 1054. These surely have not been misled by the judicial decisions of 1054 and subsequent years, if any."

The motion brought forward by Mr. Krishnaswamy Rao was put to the vote and carried by five against one.

Mr. Krishnaswamy Rao moved the omission of clause 2 of section 6.

He said :—"Even in the absence of this para the Kudiyan can, in virtue of the right conferred on him by the first para, compel the Jenmi by suit to recognise the transfer of the holding in part or whole. 'There can be no right without a remedy'."

Mr. Muthunayagom Pillay seconded the motion.

Carried.

Mr. Nagam Iyer said :—"I propose that clause 3 of section 6 be omitted altogether. The tenant and the transferee are the best judges of what their respective shares of Michavarom should be, and any settlement they may come to, with regard to apportioning of the dues on the holding, should be final, without the permission of the Jenmi. The Jenmi's interest is sufficiently protected by clause (1) of section 6, as under that clause the liability of the entire holding to the Michavarom and other dues, continues as before."

Mr. Ramanatha Rao seconded the motion.

Carried.

Mr. Nagam Iyer moved that clause (b) of section 7 (1) be omitted.

He said :—

"This section is I believe one of the most important in the Bill. The

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly